

## REMARKS

The Office Action of February 26, 2007 was received and reviewed. The Examiner is thanked for reviewing this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Claims 1, 2 and 17-22 are pending in the instant application with claims 1, 2, 19 and 20 being independent. Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 17, 19, 20 and 22 are allowed. The Examiner is thanked for the indication of allowable subject matter. By this amendment, claims 2, 17 and 18 have been amended to clarify the present invention. Therefore, claims 1, 2 and 17-22 remain pending.

Referring now to the detailed Office Action, claims 2 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Nagaishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,544,182 -- hereafter Nagaishi). This rejection is respectfully traversed at least for the reasons provided below.

With respect to independent claim 2, Applicants have amended claim 2 to recite, *inter alia*, the feature of “a signal processing unit for subjecting the first electric signal and the second electric signal to calculate a frequency, an amplitude, and a phase of the energy fluctuation of the laser beam to grasp a state of the energy fluctuation of the laser beam that enters the light amount adjuster as well as a state of the energy fluctuation of the laser beam whose energy has been adjusted by the light amount adjuster” in a similar manner to the allowed subject matter of independent claims 1, 19 and 20. Nagaishi fails to teach or disclose the feature of calculating a frequency, an amplitude, and a phase of the energy fluctuation of the laser beam, as presently claimed. Thus, it cannot be said that Nagaishi anticipates the invention as presently claimed.

Therefore, Applicants note that independent claims 1, 2, 19 and 20 are allowable as discussed above. Any claim that depends from an allowable claim is allowable as well. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to the remaining dependent claims be removed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1, 2 and 17-22 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue. If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean A. Pryor, Reg. # 48103/  
Sean A. Pryor

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204  
Suite 900, 401 9<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128  
(202) 585-8000